
Reviews of Books



JAVIER ELVIRA, INÉS FERNÁNDEZ-ORDÓÑEZ, JAVIER GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ and ANA SERRADILLA CASTAÑO (eds.), *Lenguas, reinos y dialectos en la Edad Media ibérica: la construcción de la identidad. Homenaje a Juan Ramón Lodares*. Madrid and Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert. 2008. 574 pp. ISBN 978-84-8489-305-9/978-3-86527-335-2.

Juan Ramón Lodares Marrodán died in a horrific road accident in April 2005. His colleagues at the Universidad Autónoma in Madrid held a two-day conference in his honour on 16–17 November 2006, and this attractively produced book contains most of the lectures given there. Lodares, originally a pupil of Gregorio Salvador, had become well known both inside and outside the academic world for his calm and considered defence of the use in Spain of Castilian outside Castile, a politically incorrect approach which had made him highly unpopular in several quarters; for example, when this *Bulletin* accepted his article on ‘La comunidad lingüística en la España de hoy’ (eventually published in *BHS* 82.1 (2005): 1–16) there were colleagues who felt strongly that we should not have accepted it. Despite this, his work was well written and worth reading, and he himself was charming and inoffensive despite the necessity for acquiring a thick skin.

There are twenty-five contributions in this volume. The first eleven, generally entitled ‘Lengua y sociedad: identidad y convivencia en los romances medievales de la Península Ibérica’, and the last five, from a *Mesa Redonda* entitled ‘Las lenguas de España: balance de una convivencia milenaria’, fit the title of the volume better than the intervening nine collectively summarized as ‘La evolución del castellano: cuestiones léxicas y gramaticales’. The topics of the formation and inter-relationship of the medieval dialects of the Peninsula have been the subject of a number

of collective volumes in recent years, and it is not easy for even the most dedicated specialist to keep up with them all; but this is one of the most interesting. It is still true, unfortunately, that the outsider with a knowledge of modern sociolinguistics is likely to see some of the concerns of some of the Spanish workers in this field as misplaced or even meaningless. For example, almost all the contributors seem to take for granted that delimitable Ibero-Romance dialects within the peninsula-wide continuum existed long before anybody explicitly mentioned them. This is a view which most sociolinguists elsewhere would now find old-fashioned, in that it has come to be generally accepted that although individual divergent linguistic features arise naturally, their isoglosses do not coincide naturally on the ground, so that separately identifiable dialects within a continuum (*ausbau* dialects as they are often called), as opposed to their individual features, need to be created by politicians rather than developing naturally. One of the articles here demonstrates this beautifully, without the author really noticing: Marta Lacomba’s illuminating comparative study of the *Semejanza del mundo* (of c. 1220) and the later *Lapidario* of Alfonso X (of c. 1250, before he ascended the throne) points out correctly that the second is explicitly said in the text to be in *castellano* whereas the first is said internally to be in *romanzo* or *nuestro latín*, ‘aunque’, says a puzzled Marta Lacomba, ‘la lengua utilizada es el castellano’ (357, n.22); but no, the language used in *Semejança* is not Castilian, and is indeed Romance, because the concept of Romance (contrasted with Latin *grammatica*) had been invented by the 1220s (which is why it is what Berceo says he is writing in), whereas the concept of Castilian (as opposed to other kinds of Romance) had to wait until the patronage of Alfonso el Sabio to be invented in the same way. As Ralph

Penny has so brilliantly shown, the early linguistic features which are later ascribed to particular dialects can be studied individually without begging the issue through the application of anachronistic geographically based dialect names, and maybe now they should be. Pedro Sánchez-Prieto Borja comes the closest in this volume to understanding this. It is interesting to note that one of the pioneers of the feature-based approach to early Ibero-Romance dialectology is one of the editors of this volume, but that she has not contributed a chapter (Inés Fernández Ordóñez). Yet once we get past this obstacle, many of the chapters here are valuable.

The first section begins with a historical study by José María García Martín of 'Relaciones entre los estados peninsulares y significado de las lenguas en la Baja Edad Media' (31–62). It then proceeds from east to west, with concise contributions from established experts Germán Colón (63–72) and Josep Moran i Ocerinjauregui (73–82) on Catalan; from José María Enguita Utrilla on Aragonese (83–106); and from Xulio Viejo Fernández on Asturian (107–129), in an ill-tempered piece which shows that he really does believe that mid-medieval Asturian not only existed but had a unitary and integral linguistic identity endowed with 'isoglosas definitorias' (111) and 'una nueva norma general generada ahora en el centro de Asturias' (114), despite the fact (which Viejo grants (119)) that nobody explicitly mentioned this at the time. Those who disagree with him (such as Penny and Alarcos) are being frivolous. In marked contrast, José Ramón Morala writes on 'Leonés y castellano a finales de la Edad Media' (129–48) with his usual calm common sense and intelligent authority. Bernard Darbord and César García de Lucas consider western dialect features in Arthurian literature (149–65); José António Souto Cabo writes in Galician on Galician, transcribing several texts of the mid-thirteenth century (167–90); and António Emiliano, working as usual at an intellectual level higher than most of his colleagues, considers 'O conceito de *latim bárbaro* na tradição filológica portuguesa: algumas observações gerais sobre pressupostos e factos (scripto-)linguísticos' (191–231). He laments the way that so many of his predecessors have been content merely to insult the Latin of mid-medieval Portuguese texts rather than make any effort to

understand what the scribes were actually doing (which Emiliano has done himself so spectacularly well, as in his contribution to Ralph Penny's homage volume).

The last two chapters in the first section are based geographically further south: Pedro Sánchez-Prieto Borja considers 'La variación lingüística en los documentos de la Catedral de Toledo (siglos XII y XIII)' (233–56), quite rightly insisting that the documentation from Toledo in those years attests different scribal traditions as much as, or perhaps even more than, linguistic variation, and should thus be described as manifesting 'heterogeneidad' rather than 'variación' (without mentioning the two manuscript versions of the Treaty of Cabrerros of 1206, which support his interpretation); and Javier García González contributes a thoughtful and sensible 'revisión crítica' of the study of Arabisms in Spanish (257–86).

The *Mesa Redonda* is briefly introduced by Elena de Miguel Aparicio (517–20), and then contains short presentations by María Teresa Echenique Elizondo comparing past and present relations between Ibero-Romance varieties (521–30); by Francisco Moreno Fernández on language and dialect names, suggesting that Spanish as a World Language could be referred to uncontentiously as *habla hispana* (553–59); by María Pilar Perea on Castilian-Catalan contacts (561–64); and, characteristically at much greater length, by Fernando González Ollé, 'Identidad idiomática y política lingüística: "Allá van lenguas do quieren reyes"' (531–51). The conversation which then ensued is said to have been lively. I bet it was. And, if so, it was a fitting commemoration of the honoree.

The central section seems colourless and straightforward in comparison, although of generally high quality. Mónica Castillo Lluch compares 'El castellano frente al latín: estudio léxico de las traducciones latinas de Alfonso X' (289–320); Jacinto González Cobas considers 'Construcciones anacolúpticas en la *Estoria de España* de Alfonso X' (321–40), pointing out that they rarely hinder comprehension; Marta Lacomba's piece on the *Semejança* and the *Lapidario* (mentioned above) is subtitled 'De una descripción del mundo en romance a la construcción de un espacio castellano del saber', which is acutely phrased (341–66); Raúl Orellana Calderón, 'En torno a la datación y lugar de redacción

de la *Tercera Partida* de Alfonso X el Sabio' broadly agrees with the recent account of Francisco Hernández and Peter Linehan, on the basis of different data (367–88); Ana Serradilla Castaño traces the history of the adjective *carnal* at surprising length (389–408); Marta López Izquierdo considers interjections which include *fe* (409–34); Santiago U. Sánchez Jiménez similarly considers *naturalmente* (435–66); María Azucena Penas Ibáñez discusses semantics and pragmatics with reference to the *Tratado de la Concordia de Villafáfila* of 1506 (469–92); and Luis Miguel Vicente García offers 'Notas sobre la identidad castellana en la poesía narrativa medieval' (493–514). Of these, Mónica Castillo, Marta Lacomba and Marta López all work in France, as part of the increasingly impressive Hispano-philological diaspora in that country; the other six are former colleagues of Juan Ramón Lodares, included for that reason, which explains their presence in a volume whose title seems inappropriate for their interests. Otherwise, the historical and contemporary relationships between the Ibero-Romance languages and dialects will continue to be as fascinating a topic to future generations as it was to Professor Lodares, and this volume is a welcome addition to the debates.

ROGER WRIGHT

University of Liverpool

INÉS DE LA FLOR CRAMER, *Los grupos políticos y sociales en la 'Crónica sarracina'*.

Currents in Comparative Languages and Literatures, 136. New York: Peter Lang. 2005. ISBN 0-8204-7101-1.

La *Crónica del rey don Rodrigo*, más conocida como *Crónica sarracina*, de Pedro del Corral, es una manifestación de la historiografía goticista que figura entre los productos culturales más interesantes del siglo XV. A pesar de haber sido muy leída en su época, y de haber constituido la principal fuente del ciclo de romances sobre el último rey godo y la pérdida de España, continúa siendo obra relativamente poco estudiada. De ahí que uno no pueda sino congratularse de la aparición de un estudio dedicado a ella. A la hora de abordar la espinosa cuestión de su género, Cramer la caracteriza como híbrido en que confluyen la épica, los libros de caballerías y las narraciones ascéticas, y perfila su

planteamiento a partir de las ideas de Mijaíl Bajtín sobre los géneros discursivos y Hayden White sobre la historiografía. Ello le proporciona una atalaya para su propósito principal: analizar la imagen de los grupos políticos y sociales en la obra. Así, observa que la *Crónica* tiende a ensalzar a los caballeros cristianos y presentar una visión deshumanizada de los moros, asociada a su carácter de 'otros', si bien aparecen ocasionalmente rasgos negativos en aquellos y positivos en estos en función del relato; Cramer indica que en cambio los judíos son presentados persistentemente según un estereotipo negativo y que Corral llega a inventar episodios para confirmar prejuicios tradicionales. El caso de las mujeres es distinto: la autora apunta que su representación está marcada por la misoginia, pero que llegan a tener un papel complejo comparable al que tenían en la sociedad contemporánea. Su conclusión final es que el objetivo de la *Crónica* sería inducir a la concordia a las clases dirigentes del turbulento reinado de Juan II mediante el ejemplo de la caída de los godos.

Personalmente, tiendo a discrepar en diversos aspectos de la interpretación de Cramer. Me parece que a veces subestima algo la importancia de la tradición cronística. La complejidad en el tratamiento de las mujeres podría derivarse en último término de la polémica implícita sobre el papel asignado a la Cava en la disolución del reino visigótico. Cramer suele separar elementos medievales y renacentistas en la presentación de Corral; en mi opinión, estos son a lo sumo tardomedievales. A veces uno tiene la impresión de hallarse ante una vieja tesis dada con prisas a imprenta, sin acceso reciente a una biblioteca bien dotada de fondos sobre el tema tratado y otros afines. Aparte de erratas, hay lagunas bibliográficas un tanto sorprendentes, aunque hay que reconocer la dispersión de los esfuerzos en torno a Corral. Brilla por su ausencia la única edición asequible de la obra, a cargo de J. D. Fogelquist (Madrid, 2001) – Cramer se basa en el texto de la última impresa hasta entonces (Alcalá de Henares, 1587) –, aunque quizá sea más de lamentar que no hayan sido considerados estudios desde diferentes perspectivas como el de J. M. Cacho Bleuca, 'Los historiadores de la *Crónica sarracina*', en *Historias y ficciones* (Valencia, 1992), 37–55, que hubiera llevado a Cramer a argumentar con más peso algunas